IN THE HIGH COURT OF UTTARANCHAL AT NAINITAL

(1) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 310(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 20024 of 1999)

Tulsi ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary
Forest Department, U.P.
and four Ors. ..... Respondents

(2) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 339(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 24772 of 1999)

Dhurat Singh Chauhan ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary
Forest Department, U.P.
and four Ors. ..... Respondents

(3) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 347(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 24785 of 1999)

Janak Singh ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary
Forest Department, U.P.
and four Ors. ..... Respondents

(4) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 1930(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 28018 of 1999)

Uttaranchal Van Shramik Sangh
and another ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary
Forest Department, U.P.
and two Ors. ..... Respondents

(5) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 2016(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 11571 of 1999)

Jaspal Singh ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary
Forest Department, U.P.
and four Ors. ..... Respondents

(6) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 2149(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 20181 of 1999)

Atar Singh Gusain ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary
Forest Department, U.P.
and four Ors. ..... Respondents

(7) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 2192(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 10720 of 1999)

Ratan Singh ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary

Forest Department, U.P.

and four Ors. ..... Respondents

(8) Civil Misc. Writ Petition No. 2490(S/S) of 2001

(Old No. 24770 of 1999)

Arjun Singh Mehta ..... Petitioner

Versus

State of U.P. through Secretary

Forest Department, U.P.

and four Ors. ..... Respondents

.....

Hon'ble P.C. Verma, J.

All the aforementioned writ pertitions involve common question of law and also in these petitions similar relief of regularization in the forest department has been claimed. These writ petitions are, therefore, taken up together and disposed of by a common judgment.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Standing Counsel.

The petitioners claim themselves to be the daily wage employees in the forest department and covered by the decision given by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Civil Appeal No. 3634 of 1998, State of U.P. and others versus Putti Lal.** Learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Standing Counsel agree that direction may be given to the respondents to consider the cases of these petitioners din the light of the said judgment of the Apex Csourt and those of the petitioners who are covered by the said decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court be regularised and minimum of pay scale be also paid to them until their services are regularised. Let the necessary exercise be done within a period of six weeks.

All the aforesaid petitions are disposed of accordingly.

(P.C. Verma, J)

Dt. 02.09.2003

P.Singh